

ITEMS

VOLUME 4 • NUMBER 3 • SEPTEMBER 1950
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

BASIC SOCIAL SCIENCE DEVELOPMENT:

THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL IN A NEW PROGRAM OF SUPPORT

by Pendleton Herring

OF central concern to the Council is the basic development of the social sciences. This means more rigorous research, better organization for research within universities, improved training of graduate students, greater facilities for the conduct of research, and the stimulus that comes from frequent exchange of ideas among research workers who are interested in related problems. As announced in a recent issue of *Items*, the Faculty Research Fellowships and the Interuniversity Summer Research Seminars are two new programs initiated within the last year that should contribute significantly to these objectives. The emphasis in both is upon the development of personnel and ideas and methods of work that should increase the effectiveness of research in the social sciences. This is in line with the Council's continuing conference and planning work and its Research Training Fellowships.

The recently announced program of the Ford Foundation constitutes another clear recognition of the necessity for strengthening the bases of research in the social sciences. Grants to universities whose research accomplishments are well known will provide these institutions with additional funds that can be flexibly used. While funds are often required for studying particular problems of great urgency, an even more fundamental need is support for strengthening research organization and personnel. The Ford Foundation's grants to a number of leading universities are made not for specific projects but for improving the conditions of research and whatever facilities may seem appropriate in a particular institution. Since these funds become available simultaneously to more than a dozen institutions an unusual

opportunity is provided for planning and for collaborative activity. A total grant of \$3,000,000 is available over the next five years to the participating institutions. The Council has received \$300,000 under this program for the same period.

The focus of attention in this program is the study of individual behavior and human relationships. Thus individual and social psychology, social anthropology, and sociology are most directly concerned. However, there are aspects of economics, political science, and history that will be relevant. No firm boundaries can be set in terms of disciplines for the study of phenomena so broad as those embracing the behavior of human beings and social interactions. The Ford Foundation officers state:

The Social Science Research Council has been included in this program because it is the instrumentality most used by individual scholars, universities and research organizations for interchange of information, planning and other cooperative functions in the fields described . . . Its grant will be used not so much for the support of independent research projects but rather for any additions to staff or improvements in facilities which would enhance the service it performs for other organizations and scholars.

Those familiar with the Council's record will recall a number of activities and publications within the broad area covered by the new program. For example, among such contributions may be listed: studies of relations between personality and culture, as culture conflict and crime; of the prediction of personal adjustment; the validity of psychoanalytic concepts; effects of heredity and environment on twins and foster children; opinion and attitude measurement; the social adjustment of

the physically handicapped. It would be premature to attempt to state in announcing this grant precisely what steps will be taken in developing the program. The Committee on Problems and Policy is giving much thought to the opportunities presented, and David C. McClelland, Associate Professor of Psychology at Wesleyan University, is assisting with the staff work.

The Council will be able to arrange for the preparation of appraisals of existing knowledge and research techniques, and to determine types of individual research inquiries which might be initiated. Under this program it will seek to improve communication and working relations between groups of research men dealing with cognate problems—through occasional memoranda reviewing work in progress, small research planning conferences whenever these constitute a helpful next step, and publication of materials facilitating the exchange of knowledge and experience.

The purpose of this program is reflected in the following excerpts from a memorandum describing the Ford Foundation program:

An essential step in the further understanding of human behavior is to lay plans for the increase of basic knowledge. The method for developing it is that of scientific inquiry by the most competent investigators following the most promising theory and utilizing the methods of greatest proven or potential effectiveness. Pursuit of this method requires an extensive development of the

resources for scientific research throughout the field of human behavior and social organization. The present program will therefore be seen to focus upon long-range objectives. . . .

The purpose of the grant is not the support of research projects as such, but rather the development of the personnel and the improvement of the conditions and facilities for effective research. Success is, therefore, not to be measured so much by research findings *per se* as by an increase in the number or capacity of the research workers, the improvement of their methods and the enhancement of their facilities and resources. Through emphasis on effective manning and "machine tooling" for research, rather than upon specific projects, it is hoped that the underpinning will be strengthened for subsequent activity in all the various and specialized segments of the broad area of individual behavior and human relations.

In the advancement of such objectives the Council's experience over the years fortifies the conviction that only by building broader and stronger bases in terms of research organization and facilities, personnel and training, and theory and method can we hope to have human and scientific resources for dealing with the varied problems that call for analysis and understanding. It is in these terms that the Council welcomes the first and major grant of the Ford Foundation following the Report of its Study Committee on Policy and Program, and the opportunity that is afforded for future effort that must enlist the energies of social scientists in many fields over the country.

THE BERKELEY SEMINAR ON OLD AGE RESEARCH

by Harold E. Jones

A SEMINAR at the University of California in Berkeley was one of the first to be scheduled under a grant to the Council from the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation for a program of interuniversity summer research seminars.¹ With no prior experience in such an enterprise, we decided to regard the summer program as an experimental venture and to try out a variety of procedures in a comparison of working methods. The seminar soon fell into a pattern which was a combination of workshop, reading period, and conference, with varying proportions of time given to these according to the stage of development of the various projects with which we were concerned.

One of the chief purposes of the seminar program is to give younger men an opportunity to spend a summer

on matters connected with their research interests, and to provide such men with a temporary relief from teaching. Since an interest in aging is often latent until an individual is himself explicitly committed to the process, we found our range of choice somewhat limited by this fact and also by the fact that financial arrangements were not completed until relatively late in the year.

Fortunately, the Pacific Coast Committee on Old Age Research had already been at work for several months when the seminar program was announced, and from this committee we selected two younger members, Dr. James A. Hamilton (now on the staff of Stanford University School of Medicine) and Oscar Kaplan of San Diego State College. Additional seminar members were Bruce Fisher of Fresno State College, and Frank Newman of the University of California at Berkeley. As regular participants we also had several staff members of two research groups on the university campus, the Institute of Industrial Relations and the Institute of

¹ This program was described in the March issue of *Items*. For an announcement concerning seminars in the summer of 1951, see page 36 *infra*.

Child Welfare. Clark Kerr, the director of the first-named Institute, and his colleagues Lloyd Fisher, Mason Haire, and Theodore Malm were interested in the general topic of aging in connection with their plans for a five-year study, soon to be undertaken, of social and economic aspects of age changes in the population. It is not surprising that representatives of the Institute of Child Welfare should also have a direct concern with this field, for many of the methods applicable in the study of child development have some application at later ages, and an interest in aging is readily attracted to any point where age changes are rapid.

A research seminar can have a number of different points of emphasis. In a relatively mature research field it might be concerned primarily with the theoretical systematization of the field. At a new scientific frontier it would probably be largely concerned with problems of recruiting and training personnel, the development of research techniques, and the assembly of relevant factual data. The Berkeley seminar was more nearly of the latter type. Moreover, since it included representatives of many different disciplines (economics, law, medicine, political science, and several branches of psychology) a substantial part of our work involved learning how to talk with each other, and how to plan research enterprises in which more than one discipline would be represented. Some of our members were chiefly concerned with the characteristics of aging people, within a very specialized area (e.g., mental ability), and others with interrelationships: socio-psychological, or psycho-physiological. Some had little interest in aging people, but a great deal of interest in an aging population, and the problems formulated on this basis had to do with the economic and social sequelae of retirement and pension systems, or with administrative issues in old age assistance. But it was recognized by all that essential interrelationships existed among these special interests, and that research advances are needed along a broad front.

The seminar operated through scheduled meetings of small groups, with a liberal allowance of time for individual writing and library work; opportunity for the latter was especially appreciated by visitors from smaller institutions with less adequate library facilities. In addition to other sessions, dinner conferences were held at approximately weekly intervals. Beginning at five in the afternoon and continuing until ten in the evening, each of these dealt with a specific topic and provided an opportunity for reports by various local research men, in addition to those on the regular seminar staff. As examples, at a dinner conference on physiological aspects of aging, several physicians and physiologists reported on recent advances in the study of cardiovascular changes with age,

and at a later conference a number of psychiatrists participated in a discussion of mental hygiene.

The seminar program culminated in a four-day conference which was held just prior to the Federal Security Agency's National Conference on Aging. In addition to the participants already mentioned, we were able to bring to this Berkeley meeting the remaining members of the Pacific Coast Committee on Old Age Research, including Elon Moore and Ray Baber, of the University of Oregon and Pomona College, respectively; and Roy Dorcus, Dean of Life Sciences at UCLA. Also included were representatives of eastern and other centers which have an active program in this field (Robert J. Havighurst, Chairman of the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago; Raymond Kuhlen, Professor of Educational Psychology at Syracuse University; Ivan Mersh, Assistant Professor of Medical Psychology at Washington University, and Robert Klee-meier, Director of the Moosehaven Laboratory for Research on the Processes of Aging). In addition, we were fortunate in having as a Berkeley visitor William Stephenson, who has served as a member of a research group at Oxford University, and who presented a report on the status of old age research in England.

The first day of the conference was devoted to a survey of current and projected research. On the second day there was a discussion of biological and social aspects of aging; under the latter category a report was presented by Gregory Bateson on "Cultural Ideas about Aging," and members of the Institute of Industrial Relations led a series of discussions on psychological, political, sociological, and economic factors to be considered in studying the impact of an aging population in an industrial society. The third day dealt with methodological problems in old age research, and the final two meetings, on the fourth day, with administrative problems. Discussions at these latter meetings were led by representatives of the U. S. Public Health Service and of the Social Security Administration.

The proceedings of this conference will soon be available in published form. At the concluding meeting consideration was given to a proposal which had previously been made by the writer, looking toward the establishment of a "federated" cumulative study of aging. This was described as involving a series of different samples, each relatively homogeneous, investigated in *different* research centers; thus we might have, in different centers, a rural sample composed entirely of small farmers and their wives, a sample of urban day laborers, of mechanics, of salesmen, of tradesmen or small shop owners, of members of a specific profession such as school or college teaching. The advantage of this division of labor would

be to permit specialization in the techniques of obtaining and maintaining rapport, often an important consideration in studies of older persons.

It was pointed out that if it is eventually feasible to set up such a series of projects in different universities, an advisory agency composed of members of several interested groups should devote at least a year to planning research procedures which could be followed in the different centers closely enough to yield comparable results, and which would have enough significance to justify a long period of repeated record-taking. The advisory group should include persons skilled in statistical method, including treatment of time series, and also persons experienced in dealing with only partially quantified or clinical records. All suitable data should be put on punch cards, with a standard form of statistical treatment, and with duplicate cards maintained in a central office; interviews and other qualitative records should be copied and duplicates kept in the central file. In a further statement, it was observed:

"Some of the administrative problems which are involved in any longitudinal study may be a particular matter of concern in a federated program which requires different staffs in different institutions. The lone wolf motif is still strong among scientific workers, many of whom are most efficient and productive when they are left to their own introvert devices. But the type of project we are now envisaging demands rolling up our individual iron curtains and working as a team rather than as isolated star performers. If we overcome this problem of scientific isolationism, we have the further problem of finding a sufficient number of persons who can be depended upon to have the long-term interests and the long-term vitality to carry on the kind of study that has been proposed.

"One of our first tasks must obviously be to recruit and train personnel. But we already have the personnel for an interdisciplinary national advisory committee, and it is not too early to begin a comprehensive program of research planning. If we can look forward to the eventual establishment of old age research centers in a number of universities, I would propose that in each of these institutions an interdepartmental committee be organized, with representatives from cooperating departments—psychology, sociology, and wherever feasible other departments in the social, biological, and medical sciences. Before research can actually be undertaken, there must be some assurance of continuity of staff and of continuity of interest. . . .

"... the question may be raised as to whether these general proposals do not lead in the direction of fantasy rather than of realistic scientific work. We have been thinking in terms of a 20-year longitudinal study, costing

perhaps \$200,000 a year. Associated with the main project there would be many subsidiary studies financed from other sources. As large as the main budget may seem to be, it represents only 1/100 of 1 per cent of what has officially been proposed to President Truman as the minimum needed level of expenditure in this country for private and public research. Surely this is not an unreasonably large fraction to devote to a national and interdisciplinary study of old age problems. In any event, the suggestion may be made that in planning any local study on old age, the procedures should be formulated in such a way as to permit integration with a broader research if and when it can be undertaken."

The evaluation of the seminar as a productive experience will be aided by comments from the participants. Following are two comments by a psychologist and by a professor of law, who entered the seminar with very different backgrounds in research:

"I can think of four personal values that, as a psychologist, I received from attendance at the seminar. One was the opportunity for personal contact and acquaintance with a considerable number of individuals working in or near the field. A second was the direct interchange of ideas which, by contrast with reading, is faster and more satisfactory when frames of reference and relative emphases can be immediately explored. A third value, which might not apply to others as specifically as to me, was the stimulus the meeting provided to those less well situated as to research opportunities; for me personally it meant considerable diminution of an inferiority complex about working largely alone in a relatively small institution. A fourth value was the availability, even for a short time, of the excellent library facilities of the Berkeley campus.

"I should guess that the persons attending any seminar determine, more than the plan or the machinery, the degree of its success. The characteristics of any cooperating intellectual group apply here. The number of members must be few, or they will not get to know each other and communication will be correspondingly inefficient. Each person in the group must be willing to be concerned with the problems of others, willing to learn from and to teach others, willing to seek and accept criticism."

The second comment: "... Believing that the law school and its faculty must guard against isolation within the University, I have always had an interest in relating legal problems to problems in public affairs and in other areas. This interest has been strengthened by my work in the seminar, and has already led to discussions with men in two other social science departments, as to the possibility of jointly taught courses during the coming academic year.

"In both government service and civic activities I

have worked closely with men from other disciplines. The goals, though, were not always 'scientific'; and until this summer I had not experienced extended, day-to-day, joint inquiry. Nor had I worked with physicians, psychiatrists, physiologists, and others whose interests law men usually regard as remote and esoteric.

"Those of us who were new to gerontology may have cut the pace of the seminar somewhat. Nonetheless, I believe that the Council should continue to include newcomers in its groups. My case suggests that exposure to an unknown field and its literature can be very en-

lightening—particularly as to methodology. Further, from observing the other newcomers and our many nongerontologist guests, I felt that our sophisticated colleagues benefited a good deal from the sharpness of questioning often needed to focus the discussion.

"Finally, since it will not be easy to assemble groups of experts alone, I hope that newcomers will continue joining with the experts so that the seminar technique may be developed. There is a good chance, I think, that it will become the best technique for encouraging productive research in social science."

NOTES ON THE SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE STUDY OF WORLD AREAS

by George E. Taylor

THE following notes on area programs are inspired by the second national conference on world area research held in May 1950.¹ They are reflections upon the general development of area programs and research during the last four or five years as re-evaluated by the conference. What I have to say is not intended to anticipate the complete report of the conference, now being prepared by Richard H. Heindel, and in all probability will not overlap its content in any large measure. As conference chairman, I tried to implement the directives of the Committee on World Area Research, but the views expressed here are my own responsibility.

In considering the present position of area studies, it is well to remind ourselves of their origin. The area studies movement in its present form is a product of World War II and the postwar years. We can see now, as we saw at the first conference, that this development has always tried to fulfill two important needs. One was to extend the frontiers of the academic world to many countries and many problems which had formerly been neglected. This need had been brought about by the change in the world situation and of the position of the

United States in relation to it. The other need was to adjust the older disciplines to the newer ones, especially in the social sciences. Some of the new social science disciplines emerged from the war with well deserved prestige. The area program movement grew up as a catalytic device to assist in bringing about the adjustments which these two developments demanded. Its objectives and achievements can best be assessed in relation to its double origin.

The most obvious progress has been made in meeting the need for training of research and teaching personnel, for libraries, and for academic coverage of undeveloped areas. A study of the catalogs of the major universities and colleges of the country reveals an enormous development of area programs and significant changes in curricula. The changes in the attitudes of students and faculty and university administrations, when we compare 1950 with 1945, have been such as to justify all our expenditures of time, money, and energy. It is largely because of the area programs that the curricula of the universities today are better adjusted to the facts of the modern world. European-centered education has not been displaced, but there is a closer approximation to the view that the world is round than there was formerly. There is today in the universities an atmosphere more favorable than ever before to the idea of a functional relationship between research and teaching and toward faculty teamwork in both teaching and research.

The area program has also provided a useful bridge between the universities and the government. It has done a great deal to encourage the training of persons competent to serve national needs, and to encourage coopera-

¹ Like the first national conference on the study of world areas, held in November 1947, the second conference was made possible by a grant to the Council from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and was sponsored by the Council's Committee on World Area Research. The participants, numbering 97, represented a wide range of disciplines and area interests and came from many institutions and government offices. A list of the participants will be included in the full report on the conference by Richard H. Heindel of the Council staff. A brief report on the first conference appeared in the March 1948 issue of *Items*; and a detailed report, *Area Research and Training* by Charles Wagley, was published as Council Pamphlet 6 in June 1948.

tion between the universities and government in the provision of materials and facilities for teaching and research. The area programs have combined high motivation with administrative support in concrete projects of national and scientific significance in a way that overcomes the inertia of the academic world.

The second conference revealed what was known to all, the unevenness of area programs as developed over the country. There are certain areas which have not yet been adequately exposed to any approach—let alone the area approach. In other areas, such as the Near East, the bulk of American energies have gone into research on the ancient world rather than the modern. The concern with South Asian and especially Indian studies is increasing but has some distance to go before it equals the interest in the Far East or the Soviet Union. In a field like Latin America, where an enormous amount of work has been done and the impact of the area approach has already been felt, there is still a strong need for further clarification and enterprise.

Some universities are rich in materials, personnel, and funds for work on certain areas but have lacked the organization to provide for their most effective use. Some universities have research programs based upon the area approach which are not fitted into the educational pattern. There are many area programs which do not have research units at all. Some put area before disciplinary training and others insist upon disciplinary training before the area approach. One cannot help thinking that the time has come to establish some pattern out of the unevenness which is so clear to all. The conference did not discuss criteria for area programs, but the discussion showed a good deal of agreement upon those criteria.

It would probably be agreed that the most acceptable programs are those which have some sort of administrative device recognized by the university. They would include graduate as well as undergraduate work. They would provide adequate language training and library facilities. They would have an institutionalized research program of a cooperative and interdisciplinary character. If all these criteria were insisted upon, there would obviously be very few area programs in the country. Nor is it perhaps desirable that all programs should aim at fulfilling all the most ambitious criteria. It is possible that some very productive area research is done without formal organization at all, but if area programs are to become more effective in the future, there must be some agreement upon their essentials. Unevenness is always to be expected, but variety perhaps can go too far.

The conference seemed to show that we have avoided one of the dangers predicted at the beginning of the movement to develop area studies. At the end of the war

there was a natural tendency to overemphasize the neglected areas of the world. There was the danger that the area movement would be associated entirely with these formerly neglected areas. The second conference seemed to show implicit agreement that the area approach is of great importance also for research on Europe and Latin America and other parts of the world which have been long studied and are rich in personnel and material. In this connection it is interesting to note that the difficulties of developing the area approach are greatest where the opportunities—as in Europe and Latin America—are the greatest. It is much easier to go ahead with new ideas in research on parts of the world on which there has not been a great deal of research, the materials are the scantiest, and the personnel the fewest. The rapid rise of Russian studies, we noted, was due not only to the enormous importance of the Soviet Union but also to the fact that Russia had never been either completely neglected or completely developed as a field of academic interest. There was enough personnel to provide the area programs with leadership but not enough to block the way with vested interests. The rapid development of Russian studies has done as much as anything else to help area research to avoid the danger of becoming an esoteric and highly provincial movement.

In meeting the need to adjust the newer social science disciplines to the old, progress has been qualitative rather than quantitative. At the same time that we discovered that the study of new areas was not all that was needed, we discovered that the newer disciplines cannot do all the necessary work. They are important but their knowledge must be integrated with that of the older disciplines. Many of the neglected parts of the world were composed of small societies which were appropriate for anthropological analysis. There was a natural tendency, perhaps, to overemphasize anthropology immediately after the war. Because the anthropologist must now solve the problem of dealing with complex societies or confine himself entirely to the primitive, it is no accident perhaps that one of the most stimulating papers on the theory of area research was provided by an anthropologist, Julian H. Steward.

The paper helped to open up in some round tables a discussion of the theory of cooperative and interdisciplinary research that would have been impossible three years ago. It was my impression that this type of research had grown in acceptability although it was subjected to a good deal of critical and constructive examination. The general picture, so far as the disciplines are concerned, is a complicated one. Some of the newer disciplines have remained the most preoccupied with their own interests, while some of the older ones, notably his-

tory, have gone far in their efforts to cooperate with the newer.

In one important respect the second conference showed an entirely different mood from the first. The latter expressed high hopes that area research would speed up universalization of knowledge and even lead the way toward a universal social science. Our aims are now much less ambitious. The second conference spent much more time on the concrete and extremely difficult problems of cooperation between only two disciplines. More attention was directed toward what the social sciences could do for area research than what area research could do for the social sciences. Another indication of change in attitude at the second conference was that the representatives of disciplines, instead of claiming the whole globe for their province, were in a much more cooperative and humble mood. There was far more searching for useful contributions that other disciplines might make to assist in the solution of concrete problems. Two or three years of experience in certain places have shown that we need all the help we can get from every source, that no one has all the data needed. A further indication that the area approach is making progress and concerning itself with appropriate problems is the fact that several independent research institutes, which were founded long before the area programs got under way, associated themselves with the area conference.

Another indication of the readjustment of the disciplines to each other was the strong plea for emphasis on historical depth. This seemed a very healthy sign for two reasons: Not only did the newer disciplines appear more willing to see the value of historical materials and analysis but historians were taking a much more functional view of history. The conference certainly produced no atmosphere in which the old-fashioned chronological approach could flourish. It is doubtful whether this tendency would have developed on such a large scale without area programs and area research.

Some years ago, the national pattern of compartmentalization seemed to reflect a gentleman's agreement among the disciplines not to poach upon each other's preserves! This view still has some merit but it no longer stands in the way, as perhaps it did earlier, of our accepting the importance of a comparative institutional approach. The second conference was planned to some extent around the programs on Russia and Asia, not only because the Asiatic side of Russia has long been neglected, but also to illustrate the importance of the comparative study of institutions. This still does not mean that every university must try to cover the whole world, but it does mean that there must be close coordination between universities working on various areas. The

problem of course is even deeper. It means that we have to have a map of the major societies of the world if our research efforts are to be of maximum use and appropriately directed. It is encouraging that there is now much more discussion, although not necessarily more acceptance, than there has ever been of existing hypotheses which might help in setting up an over-all institutional framework for the non-European and non-Soviet societies of the world.

These new attitudes are important for the development of teamwork in area research. The number of programs which include institutionalized research projects based on interdisciplinary teamwork is still very limited. Such research is expensive and difficult. Those who have attempted it have gone about it in their own way and more or less in isolation. There has been far too little exchange of experience between various universities and nonuniversity organizations interested in the same problems. The second area conference, indeed, was one of the few occasions upon which it has been possible to exchange experience. There is still a good deal of confusion, however, about the place of area research in the general academic context.

It is time for a careful re-examination of what we call area research. While the original definition made at the first conference still stands, we have to insist that area research has no monopoly of teamwork and interdisciplinary techniques, nor are these techniques peculiar to area research. There is no question but that this type of research is a valuable instrument for progress in the social sciences, but this is mainly because it is an effective device for research in a university setting. This is no mean thing in itself. But area research, when fully developed, is really an instrument for the fertilization of research of all varieties in the university. It is a catalytic agent, not a temporary luxury nor a stopgap measure in a national crisis.

We attempted in the second conference to discuss research methods only in relation to content. This, of course, was impossible at the first conference because few projects had been started and very little had been produced. These discussions went furthest in the Russian and Far Eastern fields, partly because of the organization of the conference. There are great achievements and enormous potentialities in other fields. The conference, in fact, seemed to take for granted that every area in the world should be surveyed with the objectives of area research in mind. There was, in other words, a favorable atmosphere for the discussion of the essential purposes and philosophy of area study.

There is now a real body of experience in area research and we can discuss the techniques of interdisciplinary

teamwork with reference to current research and published materials. We know how to develop area concentration in undergraduate and graduate programs. We are beginning to think and plan on a national scale. There is sufficient agreement on objectives and enough practical experience to make it possible for those engaged in

the newer area studies to benefit from the mistakes and achievements of others. But even to retain the ground already gained, let alone extend it, we need channels of communication to keep alive the critical, exacting, and constructive spirit that emerged in the second conference.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCE OF RESEARCH BRANCH, INFORMATION AND EDUCATION DIVISION, ASF

Frederick Osborn (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Leland C. DeVinney, Carl I. Hovland, John M. Russell, Samuel A. Stouffer.

Measurement and Prediction, Volume IV of *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, by Samuel A. Stouffer, Louis Guttman, Edward A. Suchman, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Shirley A. Star, and John A. Clausen, was published in June. This is the final volume in the series prepared under the auspices of the committee, and its publication brought the committee's program to a close. With his final report to the Council concerning this project, the chairman submitted a copy of the following letter which he had received from General George C. Marshall:

The volumes of "The American Soldier" give a unique picture of what the American soldier was thinking and feeling, at home and abroad, before, during, and after combat.

These are, so far as I know, the first quantitative studies of the impact of war on the mental and emotional life of the soldier. They add enormously to our knowledge of the factors which affect soldier morale. Every serious student of military leadership will find in these volumes important criteria by which to judge the validity of previously established theories of morale and the circumstances which modify such theories.

I suspect that the value of these books goes beyond their obvious importance to military training and that they carry implications for civilian education which the teaching profession as a whole would do well to ponder.

In the recent war the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division made available, for the first time in any army, a current picture of what was in the soldier's mind. Through special and monthly reports, this knowledge provided an important supplement to the information which formed the basis for many staff decisions.

Today, when our preparations for defense have such a critical importance, these volumes are particularly timely.

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

Ralph G. Hurlin (chairman), Robert W. Burgess, J. Frederic Dewhurst, William F. Ogburn; *staff*, Eleanor Bernert.

In response to suggestions from members of the Council and others associated with its work, the committee was appointed early in the summer to aid in planning, stimu-

lating, and expediting the production of monographs based on the 1950 census. The committee is working in close cooperation with the staff of the Bureau of the Census. As a first step, research workers concerned with uses of census data were canvassed during the summer to obtain their judgments as to types of monographs which are likely to be most needed. At meetings held on July 26 and September 7 the committee reviewed the experience with preparation of monographs after the 1920 and other censuses, and outlined a program which it is hoped will permit formulation of specific recommendations by late autumn.

CONFERENCE BOARD OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH COUNCILS (Joint with American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, and National Research Council)

Ross G. Harrison (chairman), Detlev W. Bronk, A. J. Brumbaugh, Pendleton Herring, Cornelius Krusé, Roy F. Nichols, Charles E. Odegaard, George F. Zook; *secretary*, Paul Webbink.

At its meeting on June 28 the board increased the membership of its Committee on International Exchange of Persons to twelve and appointed the following to serve during 1950-51: M. H. Trytten (chairman), National Research Council; Richard H. Heindel (secretary), Social Science Research Council; Marland P. Billings, Department of Geology and Geography, Harvard University; Francis J. Brown, American Council on Education; A. J. Brumbaugh, Shimer College; George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University; Harold C. Deutsch, Department of History, University of Minnesota; Mortimer Graves, American Council of Learned Societies; Sidney Painter, Department of History, Johns Hopkins University; William R. Parker, Department of English, New York University; C. F. Voegelin, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University; Paul Weiss, Department of Zoology, University of Chicago. The committee is the device through which the board cooperates in administration of the Fulbright program. Gordon T. Bowles, executive secretary, Francis A. Young, and Elizabeth P. Lam serve as the committee's staff. Its office is located at 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C., and inquiries concerning procedures to be followed in applying for awards for advanced research and university teaching under the

Fulbright program should be addressed to the Committee on International Exchange of Persons at that address.

Dael Wolfe, who has been executive secretary of the American Psychological Association since 1946, has accepted the position of director of the program of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, established by the Conference Board in November 1949. Tentative plans for development of this program were discussed with the Commission at a meeting in Washington on July 19.

HOUSING RESEARCH

Ernest M. Fisher (chairman), Charles S. Ascher, Jacob H. Beuscher, Howard G. Brunsman, Nicholas J. Demerath, Robert K. Merton, Robert B. Mitchell, Richard U. Ratcliff, Arthur M. Weimer, Coleman Woodbury; *staff*, Leo Grebler.

Under a contractual arrangement between the Bureau of the Census and the Council, the committee is assisting the Bureau in developing plans for tabulation and analytical treatment of data resulting from the 1950 housing census. Lloyd Rodwin, Assistant Professor of Land Economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is serving as special committee staff on this project. The committee is continuing its advisory relationships to the Division of Research of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and is cooperating in a survey of housing research undertaken for the Agency by the Building Research Advisory Board of the National Research Council. Preparation of a research planning memorandum on the housing of minority groups has been undertaken for the committee by Robert K. Merton. Plans are being formulated for a study conference to be held under the committee's auspices late next spring.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, J. Douglas Brown, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle; *staff*, Paul Webbink.

The interuniversity project for the study of labor mobility in six urban areas developed by the committee nearly three years ago is being financed in part by the Department of the Air Force. A contract between the Air Force and the Census Bureau has been signed covering field work to be done by staff experienced in collecting data for the Bureau's Monthly Report on the Labor Force. The Council has approved acceptance of an Air Force contract covering the other costs of this project. The committee, which sponsored a conference on labor productivity last May, hopes next May to sponsor a conference on techniques relevant to research on industrial relations, and in the autumn to complete a modest volume of papers summarizing existing research findings on labor mobility. The committee's 1950 *Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor* was issued in August.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON PRICE POLICIES

Vernon A. Mund (chairman), Leonard A. Doyle, Joe S. Bain, Ralph Cassady, Jr., E. T. Grether, John A. Guthrie, Roy W. Jastram, Robert B. Pettengill.

At a conference sponsored by the committee in Berkeley on June 6-8, the following papers were given: "Current Developments and Prospects in Fair Trade Legislation," by E. T. Grether, read by Roy W. Jastram; "Price Wars and Their Economic Basis," by Ralph Cassady, Jr.; "A Study of the Pacific Coast Fishing Industry," by James Crutchfield, University of Washington; "Wage Policy under Full Employment: the Swedish Experience," by Erik Lundberg, University of Stockholm and visiting professor at the University of Washington; "Price Control Programs in Agriculture," by George Mehren, Giannini Foundation; and "Retail Price Policies," by Delbert Duncan, University of California, and William J. Winsberg, Macy's, San Francisco.

PERSONNEL

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

Five Faculty Research Fellowships for three-year terms beginning this fall were awarded on July 18 by the committee in charge of the program—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul H. Buck, Fred Eggan, Paul W. Gates, Harold E. Jones, Donald G. Marquis, Dorothy S. Thomas, Schuyler C. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey. As announced in the March 1950 issue of *Items*, the Fellows will be enabled to devote at least half of their time to their own research, while continuing to carry on reduced schedules of teaching at their respective institutions. A list of the appointees and their fields of interest follows:

Louis Hartz, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University, author of *Economic Policy and Democratic*

Thought: Pennsylvania, 1776-1860, will carry on research on the comparative development of political ideologies and political values in America and Western Europe.

Earl O. Heady, Professor of Economics, Iowa State College, author of numerous substantive and methodological studies in agricultural and welfare economics, will pursue investigations relating to economic efficiency in the use of agricultural resources, and studies of research methodology in social science.

Roland N. McKean, Assistant Professor of Economics, Vanderbilt University, author of "Liquidity and a National Balance Sheet," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1949, will carry forward his studies of factors influencing the decisions of private investors and the investment policies of governments.

Charles E. Osgood, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois, author of various studies in learning and social psychology, will carry forward experiments in the application of quantitative measurement to semantics.

Paul B. Simpson, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Oregon, author of "Neo-classical Economics and Monetary Problems," *American Economic Review*, 1949, will continue his empirical studies of the Pacific Northwest and its relation to the national economy and explore some more general problems in the theory of economic behavior.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

At a meeting on June 10 the Committee on Social Science Personnel—Edward P. Hutchinson (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, W. W. Hill, Richard H. Shryock, Frank A. Southard, Jr., and Paul Webbink—awarded 17 new research training fellowships:

William R. Allen, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Duke University, for an empirical and analytical evaluation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement program.

Orville G. Brim, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Yale University, for an experimental study of the adoption and rejection of child health practices by parents, a research in culture change.

James B. Burnell, Ph.D. candidate in history, Cornell University, for training and research in England in agricultural economics and English agricultural history.

James C. Davies, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of California, for examination of the experimental techniques and empirical studies in psychology which can throw light on aspects of human nature related to democracy.

William T. Doyle, Ph.D. candidate in United States history, University of California, for a study of Andrew Furuseth, labor leader.

Allen L. Edwards, Ph.D. Northwestern University, Professor of Psychology, University of Washington, postdoctoral fellowship for study and research on personality development and psychodynamics in relation to social attitudes.

David I. Fand, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Chicago, for study of the monetary theory of the Federal Reserve Board.

Richard Jessor, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Ohio State University, for research on the formation of interpersonal concepts in relation to learned needs and class status.

Martin Kohn, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Yale University, for a learning theory analysis of the process of socialization.

David S. Landes, Ph.D. candidate in history, Junior Fellow of Harvard University, for study of entrepreneurship and the industrial revolution in Western Europe in the nineteenth century.

Everett S. Lee, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Pennsylvania, for a study of the selective factors in internal migration.

Harry M. Markowitz, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Chicago, for research on the derivation and testing of equations describing financial behavior.

William Q. Maxwell, Ph.D. Columbia University, Instructor in History, Columbia University, postdoctoral fellowship for a study of developments in medicine and public health during the Civil War.

Jerome P. Pickard, Ph.D. candidate in geography, Syracuse University, for an economic-geographic analysis in Norway of the Oslo region.

Carroll L. Riley, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of New Mexico, for an ethnological field study of the Panare and Mapoyo groups of the Orinoco River area in Venezuela.

Gideon Rosenbluth, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Columbia University, for a study of industrial concentration in Canada.

Edward O. Swanson, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Minnesota, for a comparison and follow-up of high ability high-school students with respect to their nonacademic achievement.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Melville J. Herskovits, Roy F. Nichols, Lauriston Sharp, and Charles Wagley—has awarded the following fellowships:

Edwin D. Godfrey, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in France on the "Democratic Left" and the struggle for political control of the French Labor Movement since World War II.

McKim Marriott, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Chicago, for research in India on community structure and change in Hindu peasant communities.

Lawrence K. Rosinger, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research in the United States on political and social aspects of the "Chinese Renaissance."

Alvin Wartel, Ph.D. candidate in history, Harvard University, for research on the social history and development of the colonial white community on the island of Jamaica since emancipation of the slaves.

One additional travel grant has been made:

Charles P. Loomis, Head, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State College, for analysis of communication and power structure in Costa Rica, and other travel in Central America.

DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL

At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council held in September, J. Frederic Dewhurst of the Twentieth Century Fund, Willard Hurst of the University

of Wisconsin, Alexander Leighton of Cornell University, and Donald Young of the Russell Sage Foundation were re-elected directors-at-large for the two-year term 1951-52.

Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania was elected chairman of the board of directors; Robert R. Sears of Harvard University, vice-chairman; Willard Hurst of the University of Wisconsin, secretary; and Dorothy S. Thomas of the University of Pennsylvania, treasurer. The following members of the board were elected as its Executive Committee: J. Frederic Dewhurst of the Twentieth Century Fund (chairman), Wendell C. Bennett of Yale University, Shepard B. Clough of Columbia University, Don K. Price of the Public Administration Clearing House, and Donald Young of the Russell Sage Foundation. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. of Cornell University was named chairman of the Committee on Problems and Policy, and Fred Eggan of the University of Chicago was elected a member. The other members of this committee are E. W. Burgess, Carl I. Hovland, Joseph J. Spengler, S. S. Wilks, and ex officio: Pendleton Herring, Roy F. Nichols, and Robert R. Sears.

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

George W. Stocking of Vanderbilt University has been named chairman of the Committee on Grants-in-Aid for 1950-51. Ray A. Billington of Northwestern University, Richard S. Crutchfield of Swarthmore College, and Henry W. Ehrmann of the University of Colorado are newly ap-

pointed members, and John W. Riley, Jr. of Rutgers University has been reappointed to the committee.

Edward P. Hutchinson of the University of Pennsylvania has been reappointed chairman of the Committee on Social Science Personnel, which has charge of the Council's research training fellowship program. Earl Latham of Amherst College and William W. Howells of the University of Wisconsin are newly appointed members of the committee, and Donald T. Campbell of Ohio State University, Frank A. Southard, Jr. of the International Monetary Fund, and Paul Webbink have been reappointed to the committee for the year 1950-51.

John M. Clark of Columbia University has resigned as a member of the Committee on Economic Growth. Morris E. Opler of Cornell University was reappointed to the committee following his return to the United States. Lauriston Sharp of Cornell served as substitute for Mr. Opler on this committee during his absence from the country in 1949-50.

Robert C. Angell of the University of Michigan has been appointed to the Committee on International Cooperation among Social Scientists.

Merle Fainsod of Harvard University will serve as chairman of the joint Committee on Slavic Studies, maintained by the ACLS and SSRC, during 1950-51. Cyril E. Black of Princeton University, H. H. Fisher of Stanford University, and Sergius Yakobson of the Library of Congress have been appointed to the committee. The other members are Ernest J. Simmons, Philip E. Mosely, Geroid T. Robinson, S. Harrison Thomson, and René Wellek.

PUBLICATIONS

SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 184 pp. \$1.50. Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1937; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00. This bulletin was reprinted at the suggestion of a group of teachers and research workers in the field of criminology, following repeated requests for copies while it was out of print.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25. For this volume, the author in June received the Butler Medal in silver, which is awarded annually to the graduate of Columbia University "who has during the year preceding shown the most competence in philosophy or in educational theory, practice, or administration."

Production of New Housing: A Research Monograph on Efficiency in Production by Leo Grebler. February 1950. 195 pp. \$1.75.

Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman,

Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

The Council's bulletins, monographs, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

BOOKS

Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. I, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* by S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeVinney, S. A. Star, and R. M. Williams, Jr.; Vol. II, *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath* by S. A. Stouffer, A. A. Lumsdaine, M. H. Lumsdaine, R. M. Williams, Jr., M. B. Smith, I. L. Janis, S. A. Star, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr.; Vol. III, *Experiments on Mass Communication* by C. I. Hovland, A. A. Lumsdaine, and F. D. Sheffield; Vol. IV, *Measurement and Prediction* by S. A. Stouffer, Louis Guttman, E. A. Suchman, P. F. Lazarsfeld, S. A. Star, and J. A. Clausen. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Analysis of Experience of Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Vol. I, 612 pp.; Vol. II, 676 pp.; together, \$13.50; separately, \$7.50. Vol. III, 356 pp., \$5.00. Vol. IV, 766 pp. June 1950. \$10.00.

The Public Library in the United States: The General Report of the Public Library Inquiry by Robert D. Leigh (282 pp., August 1950, \$3.75); *The Library's Public* by Bernard Berelson (194 pp., \$3.00); *The Public Library in the Political Process* by Oliver Garceau (281 pp., \$3.75); *Government Publications for the Citizen* by James L. McCamy (153 pp., \$2.50); *The Book Industry* by William Miller (170 pp., \$2.75); *The Information Film* by Gloria Waldron (299 pp., \$3.75). Prepared under the auspices of the Public Library Inquiry Committee, the last-named volume in cooperation with the Twentieth Century Fund. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

The Corporation in New Jersey: Business and Politics, 1791-1875 by John W. Cadman, Jr. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. 479 pp. \$6.00.

Steamboats on the Western Rivers: An Economic and Technological History by Louis C. Hunter. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History, the American Historical Association, and the American Council of Learned Societies. Cam-

bridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. 699 pp. \$10.00.

Wartime Industrial Statistics by David Novick and George A. Steiner. Prepared with the aid of the Council's former Committee on War Studies. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. 242 pp. Paper, \$2.00; cloth, \$3.00.

PAMPHLETS

Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services. Prepared with the assistance of the Council. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950. 47 pp. 50 cents.

A Directory of Social Science Research Organizations in Universities and Colleges by the Committee on Organization for Research. June 1950. 40 pp. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor 1950 by the Committee on Labor Market Research. 70 pp. Photo-offset. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER

RESEARCH SEMINARS 1951

Groups of social scientists or individuals interested in developing interuniversity seminars to be held in the summer of 1951 should send their proposals to the President of the Council at its New York office before December 1, 1950. The purposes of the seminar program were described in the March 1950 issue of *Items*, and an account of one of the seminars held in the summer of 1950 appears in the present issue. It is expected that four or five seminars, each of about two months' duration and each consisting of from five to eight persons, will be included in the 1951 program. Preference will be given to groups containing some persons who have had prior communication regarding intellectual objectives, research problems, or methods of approach, and participation in any single seminar will ordinarily be limited to one person from any one university. It is hoped that

final decisions with respect to plans for the summer of 1951 can be reached by about December 15.

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Circulars announcing fellowships and grants to be offered by the Council during the year 1951 will soon be distributed by mail. The categories of awards and the applicable regulations will be essentially the same as in 1950. January 15, 1951 will be the closing date for receipt of applications or nominations for all categories of awards to be made in the spring of 1951. This departure from the previous practice of setting different dates for the several categories has been made in order that preliminary interviewing of candidates may be carried out more systematically. Applications filed after January 15, will receive such consideration as may be feasible, but no assurance of prompt action can be given.

Inquiries concerning each type of award should be addressed to the Washington office of the Council, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1950: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, PHILIP M. HAUSER, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, OTTO KLINEBERG, CLYDE KLUCK-HOHN, LYLE H. LANIER, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, ARTHUR W. MACMAHON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, GEORGE W. STOCKING, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; RICHARD H. HEINDEL, *Executive Associate*; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*